

1 HOLLAND & KNIGHT LLP
2 Charles L. Coleman, III (65496)
3 Tara S. Kaushik (230098)
4 Thomas D. Leland (Pro Hac
5 Leah E. Capritta (Pro Hac
6 50 California Street, Suite 2800
7 San Francisco, CA 94111
Telephone: (415) 743-6900
Fax: (415) 743-6910
E-mail: charles.coleman@hklaw.com
tara.kaushik@hklaw.com
thomas.leland@hklaw.com
leah.capritta@hklaw.com

8 Attorneys for Plaintiff
9 UNITED ENERGY TRADING, LLC

10 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

11 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

12 SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

13 UNITED ENERGY TRADING, LLC,

) Case No.: 3:15-CV-2383

14 Plaintiff,

) STIPULATED REQUEST FOR AN
15) ENLARGEMENT OF TIME TO FILE
OPPOSITION AND REPLY BRIEFS
16) REGARDING DEFENDANTS' MOTION
TO DISMISS, CONTINUANCE OF
17) HEARING DATE, AND [PROPOSED]
ORDER [RULES 6-2 AND 7-7]

vs.

18 PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC
19 COMPANY, a California corporation.;
20 ALBERT TORRES, an individual; BILL
21 CHEN, an individual; TANISHA ROBINSON,
an individual,

Defendants.

) Judge: Hon. Richard Seeborg

22)
23)
24)
25)
26)
27)
28)
COMES NOW the Plaintiff, United Energy Trading, LLC, by and through its attorneys,
Holland & Knight, LLP, and the Defendants, Pacific Gas and Electric Company, Albert Torres, Bill
Chen and Tanisha Robinson, by and through their attorneys Paul Hastings, LLP, and hereby file
their Stipulated Request for an Enlargement of Time to File Opposition and Reply Briefs Regarding

STIPULATED REQUEST FOR AN ENLARGEMENT
OF TIME TO FILE OPPOSITION AND REPLY BRIEFS
REGARDING DEFENDANTS' MOTION TO DISMISS
AND TO CONTINUE HEARING DATE

CASE NO.: 3:15-CV-2383

Holland & Knight LLP
50 California Street, Suite 2800
San Francisco, CA 94111
Tel: 415.743.6900
Fax: 415.743.6910

1 Defendants' *Motion to Dismiss* and continue the related hearing date. In support of the same, the
 2 Parties state as follows:

3
 4 On February 4, 2016, Defendants filed a *Motion to Dismiss* in response to Plaintiff's
 5 underlying *Amended Complaint*. (Dkt. No. 79.)

6 Per Local Rule 7-3(a), Plaintiff's *Brief in Opposition* to this *Motion* is due by February 18,
 7 2016.

8
 9 Per Local Rule 7-3(c), Defendants' *Reply Brief in Support* of their *Motion to Dismiss* is due
 10 seven days from the filing of Plaintiff's *Opposition*, and no later than February 25, 2016.

11 The hearing date for this *Motion to Dismiss* is currently set for March 10, 2016. (Dkt. No.
 12 79.)

13 Plaintiff and Defendants now file this stipulated request that the due dates for the *Opposition*
 14 and *Reply* briefs, and the hearing date, be enlarged as follows:

15 That Plaintiff's *Brief in Opposition* to Defendants' *Motion to Dismiss* now be due March 18,
 16 2016;

17 That Defendants' *Reply in Support* of their *Motion to Dismiss* be due fourteen (14) days
 18 from the date Plaintiff's *Opposition* is filed and no later than April 1, 2016;

19 That the hearing date be continued to April 21, 2016.

20 Both briefing enlargements are sought in advance of the expiration of either filing deadline,
 21 pursuant to Local Rule 6-6(a).

22 The hearing continuance is sought before Plaintiff's *Opposition* has been filed and before
 23 the date that *Opposition* is due, currently February 18, 2016. It is thus properly requested under
 24 Local Rule 7-7(a).

The Parties have previously submitted stipulated requests to extend the time for Defendants to respond to Plaintiff's *Complaint* by two weeks and to Plaintiff's *Amended Complaint* by one month.

The Parties have also previously jointly requested changes to the briefing schedule regarding Defendants' *Motion to Dismiss* all claims of Plaintiff's original *Complaint*.

No other enlargements have been sought by the parties, and all of their joint requests have been granted.

None of the sought enlargements will otherwise change the schedule of case.

Good cause exists for all enlargements sought herein because: (1) none prejudices any of the Parties or the Court, (2) both serve to maintain the thirty-five (35) day notice schedule contemplated by Local Rule 7-2(a), and (3) both grant the Court more than the minimum amount of time to review the briefing as contemplated by Rule 7-2.

THEREFORE, pursuant to Local Rules 6-2(a) and 7-7(a), the Parties respectfully file this stipulated request that Plaintiff's *Brief in Opposition* to Defendants' *Motion to Dismiss* now be due March 18, 2016; that Defendants' *Reply in Support* of their *Motion to Dismiss* be due fourteen (14) days from the date Plaintiff's *Opposition* is filed and no later than April 1, 2016; and that the hearing on this matter be continued to April 21, 2016. The declaration of Thomas D. Leland, required by Local Rule 6-2, is filed contemporaneously with this *Motion*.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: February 11, 2016

By: /s/ Adam M. Reich

Adam M. Reich
Counsel for Defendants

Dated: February 11, 2016

By: /s/ Thomas D. Leland

Thomas D. Leland
Counsel for Plaintiff

ORDER

Good cause appearing therefor, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED THAT the Case Schedule is modified as follows:

Plaintiff's *Brief in Opposition* to Defendants' *Motion to Dismiss* is now due March 18, 2016.

Defendants' *Reply in Support* of their *Motion to Dismiss* is due fourteen (14) days from the date Plaintiff's *Opposition* is filed and no later than April 1, 2016.

The date of the hearing on this *Motion to Dismiss* is now set for April 21, 2016.

PURSUANT TO STIPULATION, IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: 2/11/16

ERED.
Richard Schenck

The Honorable Richard Seeborg

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Holland & Knight LLP
550 California Street, Suite 2800
San Francisco, CA 94111